

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 were pending in the application at the time of the Office Action. The specification was objected to. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 1-8 were objected to based on informalities. The Abstract of the specification was objected to. The Oath/Declaration was considered defective. Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The Drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 1, 5-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claims 2-4 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. By this response, Applicant has cancelled claims 1-9 with out prejudice or disclaimer¹ and added new claims 10-30. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims are based in the specification as originally filed and that no new matter has been added. Entry of the claim amendments is respectfully requested. As such, claims 10-30 are presented for the Examiner's consideration in light of the following remarks.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

A. Examiner Telephone Interview

Applicant and applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on July 1, 2008. The Examiner and Applicant agreed that the amendments included herein appear to distinguish over the cited prior art pending an updated search. This response includes the substance of the Interview.

B. Objections

1. Objection to Specification

The specification was objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink (Para [19], line 4). By this amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to delete the embedded

¹ Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any cancelled claim in a subsequent divisional or continuation application.

hyperlink. In light of this amendment to the specification, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The specification was also objected to for the use of the trademark "IBM's MQ-Series" (Para [5], line 3), which should be capitalized. Applicant has amended the specification to capitalize and correct the typographical usage of this trademark and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

2. Objection to Claims

Claims 1-8 are objected to because of several informalities. Claims 1-8 have been canceled. These objections are therefore moot.

3. Objection to Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the error in the word "campsite". This typographical error has been amended to replace the word "campsite" with the word "composite". Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

4. Objections to Oath / Declaration

The oath or declaration is objected to because the oath/declaration did not have the mailing address and was not dated by the inventor. However, 37 C.F.R. 1.63(c) states, with emphasis added:

(c) Unless such information is supplied on an application data sheet in accordance with § 1.76, the oath or declaration must also identify: (1) The mailing address, and the residence if an inventor lives at a location which is different from where the inventor customarily receives mail, of each inventor.

Thus, the mailing address can be supplied in the application data sheet, and does not have to be in the oath or declaration itself. The Applicant submits that the Application Data Sheet originally filed with this application contained the Mailing Address and residence of the inventor.

In addition, Applicant refers the Examiner to MPEP 602.05 which discusses that the Patent Office "no longer checks the date of execution of the oath or declaration and the Office will no longer require a newly executed oath or declaration . . . where the date of execution has been omitted." As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the oath or declaration originally filed is not defective and requests that the objections to the oath and declaration be withdrawn.

5. Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show all steps of guaranteeing the invocation as described in the specification. The drawings have been amended to include one new drawing, Figure 5, which depicts a flowchart of one embodiment of a method for guaranteeing the invocation of a composite service as described in Paragraph 12 of the original specification as filed. As such, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added and requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

C. Rejection on the Merits

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-9 have been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is therefore moot.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 9 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 as moot.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Endicott et al. (*Endicott*, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,588). Claims 1, 5, 6, 9 have been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 is therefore moot.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2, 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Endicott* in view of *Mutschler* (*Mutschler*, U.S. Patent No. 6,253,366). Claims 2, 3 have been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is therefore moot.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Endicott* in view of *Mutschler* and further in view of *Huff* et al. (*Huff*, U.S. Patent No. 6,457,064 b1). Claim 4 has been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is therefore moot.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Endicott* in view of *Just* (*Just*, U.S. Patent No. 7,171,672). Claim 7 has been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is therefore moot.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Endicott* in view of *Grigsby* (*Grigsby*, U.S. Patent No. 6,804,773). Claim 8 has been canceled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is therefore moot.

D. New Claims

By this response, Applicant has added new claims 10-30. Applicant submits that new claims 10-30 are based in the originally filed specification and/or claims and that no new matter has been added. As discussed in the Telephone Interview with the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 10-30 are allowable over the prior art since the prior art does not teach

...a method of guaranteeing an invocation of a composite software service, the method comprising: ...

tracking the connectivity and data dependencies among the one or more embedded software services contained within the composite software service;

tracking a context of the composite software service, the context including states of execution of the one or more embedded software services

as recited in new independent claim 10. Furthermore, the prior art does not teach

...a method of guaranteeing an invocation of a composite software service, the method comprising: ...

generating an execution graph representing connectivity and data dependencies among the one or more embedded software services contained within the composite software service;

generating an invocation map having data structures to hold a context of the composite software service, the context including states of execution of the one or more embedded software services;

traversing the execution graph and ordering the one or more embedded software services into steps of invocation; associating a unique ID for each step of invocation...

as recited in new independent claim 19. As such, Applicant respectfully requests entry and allowance of new independent claims 10 and 19, and their associated dependent claims 11-18 and 20-30, respectively.

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 10 and 19 are distinguishable over the cited references. *Endicott* teaches enhancements to an Object Oriented Programming environment, *Endicott*, col. 1, ll. 9-11, which provide “a more efficient method resolution scheme and the ability to add method programs and object instance data to a class definition without the need to recompile the majority of the base code.” *Id.* at Abstract. However, *Endicott* does not teach the elements of claims 10 or 19.

Furthermore, *Endicott* and any of the other cited references – either individually or in combination – fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the new claims. For example, *Mutschler* teaches “to avoid visiting the same parent more than once” when visiting nodes representing classes in a class hierarchy, and algorithms for “traversing [a] meta-model to obtain information about said component parts and relationships of said primary components...expressing relationships among said generalized software components...” *Mutschler* at col. 15, ll. 17-25, col. 15, ll. 66-col. 16, ll. 8, and col. 24, ll. 4-18. However, *Mutschler* does not teach the elements of claims 10 or 19.

Huff teach “a means for detecting the input event directed to the selected one of the active connection threads in the multi-threaded process and to route the input event to the selected thread” and “a means for monitoring and storing information on the active connection threads, such information indicating which one of the active connection threads is executing the input event.” *Huff*, col. 13, ll. 20-31. However, *Huff* fails to teach the elements of claims 10 and 19.

Just teaches a “method of automatically generating client side proxies with included error handling...wherein the recovery information comprises a retry parameter specifying the number of times an error recovery procedure should be attempted.” *Just* at col. 18, ll. 25-54. However, *Just* also fails to teach the elements of claims 10 and 19.

Finally, *Grigsby* teaches a computer system including an interface to “receive other arguments such as the time to wait between retries, [and] the number of times to retry.” *Grigsby* at col. 2, ll. 31-39. However, *Grigsby* also fails to teach the elements of claims 10 and 19.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references teaches, by themselves or in combination, the elements of new claims 10 and/or 19 or their dependent claims.

E. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form.

Applicant notes that this response does not discuss every reason why the presented claims are distinguished over the cited art and the prior art. Most notably, applicant submits that many if not all of the dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the cited prior art. Applicant has merely submitted those arguments which it considers sufficient to clearly distinguish the claims over the cited prior art.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of July, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/sara d. jones/ Registration # 47,691
SARA D. JONES
Registration No. 47,691
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

SDJ: vlr